

## **REMARKS**

### **Claim Amendments**

The formality rejections are overcome by amendments.

Claim 1 is amended by removing the option for R<sup>b</sup> being alkenyl. Thus, the compounds of formula B and B-2 cannot be the same. The proviso stating the same has been removed as it now would be redundant.

Three new claims are added. Support for these can be found, for example, on page 2, lines 30-31.

### **The Rejections Under 35 USC § 103**

Claims were rejected as allegedly unpatentable over US 6,007,740.

The Office Action alleges that it would have been obvious to place the compound satisfying formula IV in the claims herein, which are allegedly present in the composition of use example 33 of the reference, into the compositions of use examples 24 and 26 of the reference. The point of motivation is that the compounds of use example 33 are “useful for the liquid crystal medium and display devices.” Applicants submit that such general motivation is not adequate under the law for the alleged combination. Under the motivation provided, every single compound known to be useful for a liquid crystal medium and display device would be obvious to add to any given liquid crystal medium. Such is also not scientifically reasonable and is not adequate under the law for rendering the claimed invention obvious.

The allegations with respect for formula B and B-2 are moot in view of the amendments. Use example 24 teaches a compound corresponding to the compound of formula B-2 of this application, which has an alkenyl group at the position for R<sup>b'</sup> of this application. Nothing in this example teaches or suggests a compound of formula B, which cannot have an alkenyl group in the corresponding position. Use example 26 contains a compound which in the same position for R<sup>b</sup> of this application contains an alkyl group. Nothing in this example teaches or suggests a compound of formula B-2, which cannot have an alkyl group in the corresponding position.

Applicants also bring to the attention of the Examiner the new claims which recite the feature that the medium has a threshold voltage of less than 1 V, or of 0.65 to 0.75 V. Both use examples 24 and 26 have threshold voltages that are significantly higher, i.e., 1.98 and 2.12, respectively. Thus, these claims are also not obvious for this additional reason.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,



Csaba Henter, Reg. No. 50,908  
Anthony J. Zelano, Reg. No. 27,969  
Attorneys for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.  
Arlington Courthouse Plaza I  
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400  
Arlington, Virginia 22201  
Direct Dial: 703-812-5331  
Facsimile: 703-243-6410

Filed: May 1, 2006

K:\MERCK\2000 - 2999\2839\REPLY MAY 06.DOC